UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,201	12/19/2005	Soumitra Roy	UPN-P3067-2	9061
270 7590 01/09/2008 HOWSON AND HOWSON SUITE 210			EXAMINER	
			GUZO, DAVID	
501 OFFICE CENTER DRIVE FT WASHINGTON, PA 19034		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1636	<u> </u>
				-
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/561,201	ROY ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David Güzo	1636			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2005. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims		•			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-43 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

10/561,201 Art Unit: 1636

Election/Restriction

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-19, drawn to methods of culturing a chimeric adenovirus in a selected host cell, chimeric adenoviruses produced by said method and host cells comprising said adenovirus.

Group II, claim(s) 20, drawn to an isolated simian adenovirus having the sequence of SEQ ID NO:12.

Group III, claim(s) 21, 25-28, 34-37, drawn to simian adenovirus nucleotide sequences.

Group IV, claim(s) 22-24, drawn to a simian adenovirus protein and a method for targeting a cell having an adenovirus receptor.

Group V, claim(s) 29-33, 38-39, 41-42, drawn to a recombinant adenovirus having a capsid comprising a hexon protein of SEQ ID NO:13, a method for delivering a heterologous gene to a target cell or inducing an immune response.

Group VI, claim(s) 29-33, 38-39, 41-42, drawn to a recombinant adenovirus having a capsid comprising a penton protein of SEQ ID NO:14, a method for delivering a heterologous gene to a target cell or inducing an immune response.

Group VII, claim(s) 29-33, 38-39, 41-42, drawn to a recombinant adenovirus having a capsid comprising a fiber protein of SEQ ID NO:15, a method for delivering a heterologous gene to a target cell or inducing an immune response.

Group VIII, claim(s) 40, drawn to a method for repeat administration of a heterologous gene to a mammal.

Group IX, claim(s) 43, drawn to a method of eliciting an immune response wherein the host is primed with a DNA vaccine prior to administration of the recombinant adenovirus.

10/561,201 Art Unit: 1636

The inventions listed as Groups I-IX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of Group I involves the generation of chimeric adenoviruses comprising the 5' and 3' terminal regions (i.e. ITRs) from one serotype and the internal region (at least hexon, penton and fiber genes) from another serotype. Each of the other Groups is characterized by a special technical feature which defined an advance over that of Group I. The special technical feature of Group II is an isolated simian adenovirus having the sequence of SEQ ID NO:12, which defines an advance over the chimeric adenovirus of Group I because it is a materially distinct composition having a unique sequence and uses which are not obvious over the adenoviruses and methods of Group I. The special technical feature of Group III involves specific nucleotide sequences encoding portions of a simian adenovirus genome, which defines an advance over Groups I and II in that the specific portions or genes of a simian adenovirus genome are unrelated to the chimeric adenoviruses of Group I and read on specific portions of any simian adenovirus, not the specific SEQ ID NO of Group II. The special technical feature of Group IV is a method for targeting a cell having an adenovirus receptor comprising delivering a simian adenovirus protein which defines an advance over Groups I-III in that said protein compositions are not used in the methods of the other Groups and are unrelated to the simian nucleotide sequences of Groups II-III. The special technical feature of each of Groups V-VII is the specific amino acid sequences of the hexon, penton and fiber proteins, respectively. Each of these sequences is unique and unrelated to the others. None of the other Groups requires these sequences and the sequences have separate uses other than those recited in the other Groups. The special technical feature of Group VIII is administration of a heterologous gene to a mammal using two different recombinant vectors which represents an advance over the other Groups because the method uses two different recombinant vectors, which is not taught or suggested by the other method or composition Groups. The special technical feature of Group IX is a method of eliciting an immune response wherein the host is primed with a DNA vaccine prior to administration of the recombinant adenovirus which is an advance over the other Groups because of the priming with a DNA vaccine prior to the administration of the adenovirus step is not taught or suggested by any of the other Groups.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after

10/561,201

Art Unit: 1636

the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

10/561,201 Art Unit: 1636

<u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Guzo, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0767. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

10/561,201 Art Unit: 1636

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 7

David Guzo January 1, 2008